Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,869	HUUSKONEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
·.	José A. Fortuna	1731
All Participants:	Status of Application	n:
(1) <u>José A. Fortuna</u> .	(3)	
(2) Timothy E. Levstik.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 24 January 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applican	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 6 and 9		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum</li> </ul>	. The examiner will provide a ate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli	icant/Applicant's Poprosentati	ive Signature – if appropriate)
(Appil	cantrapplicant's representati	ive digitature – ii appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicants' attorney to change, what it seems to be a typographical error, on claims 6 and 9, lines 3 and 4 respectively, where the surface roughness units are given in millimeters, (mm) instead of micrometers, ( $\mu$ m). Mr. Levstik admitted that it was a typographical error and that the unit should be changed to  $\mu$ m. Mr. Levstik indicated also that he changed the same mistake in claim 1, but missed them on the new claims.